

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 28, 30-36, 38-43, 48-51, and 65 are pending. Claims 1-12, 14, 28, 30-36, 38, 39, 42, 43, 48-51, and 65 are rejected. Claims 13, 40, and 41 are objected to. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 7, 28, 38, 48, 50, 51, and 65 have been amended and claims 3 and 4 have been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment may be properly entered as it places the application in condition for allowance, and does not raise new issues requiring further searching.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 38 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claim 38 is rejected for having insufficient antecedent basis for “said collection device” and claim 65 is indefinite for reciting “a first collection device” where a second collection device is not claimed. Applicant has amended claim 38 to recite “said cyclone” in place of “said collection device” to address the insufficient antecedent basis rejection. Furthermore, claim 65 is amended to remove “first” from “a first collection device” to address the indefiniteness rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 28, 30, 31, 38, 39, 42, 43, 48-51, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Trevisan (USPN 5,421,885). Independent claims 1, 48, and 65 have been amended to recite, in part, “a vacuum receiver that houses a filter” or “filter assembly” and independent claim 28 has been amended to recite, in part, “said vacuum device housing a filter.” Trevisan teaches using an auxiliary fan 36 to draw powder through pipe 37 from twin centrifugal separators 29 to a small intermediate centrifugal separator 38. See col. 4, line 40 to col. 5, line 10. Trevisan fails to disclose drawing powder into a vacuum receiver or

device that houses a filter. Therefore, amended claims 1, 28, 48, and 65, and the claims that dependent therefrom, is not anticipated by Trevisan and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9, 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Trevisan in view of Shaneyfelt (USPN 5,288,324). Shaneyfelt is cited in the Office action for disclosing a spray booth with a rotatable floor. Shaneyfelt does not teach drawing powder through a vacuum receiver or device that houses a filter assembly. Thus, combining Shaneyfelt with Trevisan does not overcome the deficient teaching of Trevisan. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 9, 32-36 is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Date: Mar. 9, 2007

By: MRHull
Mark R. Hull, Reg. No. 54,753
(216) 622-8419